Subject No. 36.
Separation of Magisterial duties from Amildars and appointment of Stationary Sub-Magistrates.

Summary of discussion.—Amildars have a great variety of duties to discharge; their Revenue work alone is sufficient to engage them fully. They are constantly travelling in their Taluks, whereby there is great delay in the disposal of their criminal work besides the inconvenience to which parties and witnesses are put in having to go after them. It is better therefore to divest them of Magisterial work and appoint Stationary Sub-Magistrates as in the Madras Presidency. These would also be less biassed than Amildars often are, with their sometimes too close acquaintance with the parties concerned. A separation of functions in this way will conduce to the prompt and proper discharge of all functions.

Mr. Sadasiva Rao (Pleader and Landholder and R. M. from Dodballapur Municipality) urged that this would lower the Amildar's prestige and make him less useful. The Amildar's tours can cause no inconvenience, as he is required to attend at the Head-quarters of his Taluk for the disposal of his Magisterial work.

Dewan's reply.—The separation of Magisterial functions from Amildars and the appointment of Stationary Sub-Magistrates is now impracticable. Munsiffs are also Magistrates and in several places afford the relief required.

Subject No. 37.
Appeals to Government from Chief Court's decisions.

Summary of discussion.—Appeals should lie to the Government against the decisions of the Chief Court on points of Law. As it is, two Judges sit and dispose of cases, and when they err, the party is without a remedy.

Mr. Sadasiva Rao (Pleader and Landholder and R. M. from Dodballapur Municipality) said that this was not necessary. If the Chief Court err, they entertain applications for review of their decisions if the error is pointed out to them. Where is litigation to end if there be a further appeal from the Chief Court? It is expensive enough to go or be dragged up to the Chief Court.

Dewan's reply.—No arrangements now exist for such appeals which cannot be allowed without the intervention of another Judiciary.

Subject No. 38.
Search of Sub-Registrar's Books.

Summary of discussion.—The present rules prohibit parties who search Sub-Registrars Books from taking notes. This should be amended. Index books should be promptly written up or there is risk of searchers being misled. The requisite search should be made by Sub-Registrars themselves and the result certified by them.

Dewan's reply.—The rule referred to relates to inspection of Sub-Registrar's Books. It is unnecessary to take notes, and facilities to take notes may also prove facilities to tampering with the entries in the books themselves. Certificates of searches proving fruitless or certified copies of any entries selected on such inspection can always be obtained on application to Sub-Registrars.